REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

No claims are currently being canceled.

Claims 1 and 8 are currently being amended. Support for the amendments made to claims 1 and 8 may be found, for example, on page 15, line 3 to page 18, line 3 of the specification.

No claims are currently being added.

This amendment amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-14 are now pending in this application.

Request of Consideration of Proprietary Information Disclosure Statement

The PTO is respectfully requested to provide an indication of consideration of a Proprietary Information Disclosure Statement (PIDS) filed on December 10, 2001. Please note that the PIDS referenced two co-pending U.S. patent applications, which have now matured into U.S. Patent No. 6,778,288 and U.S. Patent No. 6,795,210, respectively.

Claim Objections:

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 8 were objected to because "time series" should be changed to "sequence". By way of this amendment and reply, claims 1 and 8 have been amended to make such a change. Also, the Abstract has been amended to reflect this change, as well as to remove the word "means" from the Abstract.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,587,861 to Wakai et al. This rejection is traversed with respect to presently pending claims 1-14, for at least the reasons given below.

Wakai et al. describes a job selection or a printer selection for printing data which is sent to a first printer and also to other printers.

However, Wakai et al. does not disclose or suggest a job synthesizing means or a job schedule succeeding means as recited in claim 1, and Wakai et al. does not disclose or suggest the "generating" step or the "succeeding" step as recited in claim 8.

Regarding claim 1, the Office Action asserts that the daemon module 105 of Wakai et al. executes a synthetic job, and as such corresponds to the claimed job synthesizing means. However, Wakai et al. does not disclose or suggest that the daemon module 105 executes a synthetic job. Rather, the daemon module 105 monitors the database 104, detects an executable job, and performs printing, transmission or notification. Wakai et al. does not disclose or suggest combinations of input and output jobs. Further, the synthetic job of Claim 1 is a synthesis of an input-related job "which has been executed" and an output-related job "which is not executed yet". These features are not disclosed or suggested by Wakai et al.

In a multi-function peripheral and the like, copying typically corresponds to "a series of jobs for reading and copying documents" and faxing typically corresponds to "a series of jobs for reading and sending documents", and thus not many processings are completed at the input stage.

Thus, in a case that processing is completed at the stage at which documents are read by image scanners and thereafter printing and faxing are performed, a combination of a job which will be executed hereafter and a job which is read by the image scanner, that is, a synthesis of an input-related job "which has been executed" and an output-related job "which is not executed yet", is an important aspect of the claimed invention. This feature is not disclosed nor suggested by Wakai et al.

Further, Wakai et al. does not disclose or suggest that such a synthesis of an input-related job "which has been executed" and an output-related job "which is not executed yet" are succeeded between two separate devices, as recited in claims 1 and 8.

Accordingly, presently pending independent claims 1 and 8 are not anticipated by Wakai et al.

The presently pending dependent claims are patentable due to the specific features recited in those claims, as well as for their dependency on either base claim 1 or base claim 8 (as discussed above).

For example, regarding dependent claims 2 and 9, the Office Action asserts that a synthetic job (combination of jobs) corresponds to an action polled from database 104 (col. 23, lines 26 to 28) in Wakai et al. However, this assertion is incorrect, since the particular action of Wakai et al. only polls the database to perform an action or an operation that has been registered, whereby there is no description of synthesizing a job.

Accordingly, dependent claims 2 and 9 are patentable for these additional reasons.

Conclusion:

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date _June 22, 2005_   By _Phillip J. Articola_

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6162
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Pavan K. Agarwal
Registration No. 40,888

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819

~~DISCLOSURE OF THE INVENTION~~ ABSTRACT

A job executing system in which , with respect to a same processing object DC1, designated jobs are executed in ~~time-series~~ sequence, includes: a job management ~~means 47~~ unit for managing input-related job JB11 which executes chiefly input processing and output-related jobs which chiefly executes output processing; and a job synthesizing ~~means 40~~ unit for generating a synthetic job B (DC1, JB11, JB12) constituted by an input-related job which has been already executed, and an output-related job which will be executed hereafter.